

F. Christopher Austin, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 6559
caustin@weidemiller.com
WEIDE & MILLER, LTD.
10655 Park Run Drive, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89144
Tel: (702) 382-4804
Fax: (702) 382-4805

Attorneys for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

SATA GmbH & Co. KG, a German
Corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

Qingdao Hanspray New Material
Technology Co. a Chinese Company;
Qingdao Hanbo Plastic Technology Co. Ltd.,
a Chinese Company; and Hanspray
Industries Holdings Co., Ltd., a Chinese
Company,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:22-cv-01832-GMN-EJY

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
EXTEND THE DEADLINE TO
RESPOND TO THE COMPLAINT**

(First Request)

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1) and Local Rule 1A 6-1, Plaintiff SATA GmbH & Co. KG (“Plaintiff” or “SATA”) and Defendants Qingdao Hanspray New Material Technology Co. a Chinese Company; Qingdao Hanbo Plastic Technology Co. Ltd., a Chinese Company; and Hanspray Industries Holdings Co., Ltd., a Chinese Company, (collectively “Defendants” or “Hanspray Defendants”), by and through their respective counsel of record, hereby agree and stipulate to a thirty-day extension of time for Defendants to file and serve their answers or other responses to the Complaint from the current deadline of September 22, 2022, up to and including December 22, 2022. This is the first request by the parties for such an extension.

///

///

1 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 6(b) provides in pertinent part that “[w]hen an act may
 2 or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time: (A) ... if
 3 request is made, before the time or its extension expires” Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). Indeed, “[u]nder
 4 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b), the court may, for good cause, extend a deadline if a request
 5 is made “before the original time or its extension expires The Ninth Circuit has equated good
 6 cause with the exercise of due diligence.” *Maxson v. H&R Block, Inc.*, Case No.: 2:16-cv-00152-
 7 APG-CWH, 2017 WL 1078633, at *2 (D. Nev. Mar. 21, 2017) (citations omitted).

8 This stipulation is made before the expiration of the “original time” and good cause exists
 9 for the stipulated extension to provide Defendants with an opportunity to consult with their
 10 undersigned Defense counsel in this matter. This is a complex patent infringement action filed
 11 against foreign defendants all of which reside in China. Defendants only retained the undersigned
 12 counsel a few days ago and will need additional time to consult with counsel. This task has been
 13 rendered more complicated by the fact that such communications have and likely will continue to
 14 require the employment of translation services both for oral consultation and document review.

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 For the foregoing reasons, the parties hereby stipulate to extend the deadline for the
2 Defendants to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint to December 22, 2022.

3 DATED: November 21, 2022.

4 **IT IS SO AGREED AND STIPULATED:**

5 **DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC**

6 By: /s/Steven A. Caloiaro
7 Steven A. Caloiaro (NVB 12344)
8 100 W. Liberty Street, Suite 940
9 Reno, NV 89501
10 scaloiaro@dickinsonwright.com
11 775-343-7500

12 Kevin D. Everage (NVB 15913)
13 3883 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Suite 800
14 Las Vegas, NV 89169
15 keverage@dickinsonwright.com

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
17 *SATA GmbH & Co. KG*

5 **WEIDE & MILLER, LTD.**

6 By: /s/ F. Christopher Austin
7 F. Christopher Austin, Esq. (NVB 6559)
8 10655 Park Run Drive, Suite 100
9 Las Vegas, NV 89144
10 caustin@weidemiller.com
11 702-382-4804

12 *Attorneys for Defendants, Qingdao Hanspray*
13 *New Material Technology Co.; Qingdao*
14 *Hanbo Plastic Technology Co. Ltd.; and*
15 *Hanspray Industries Holdings Co., Ltd.*

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED:**

17 
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

19 DATED: November 22, 2022